

On Some Linguistic Features of the 'Simple Narrative Slavonic Register'

Song, Eun-Ji*

I. Introduction

The formation of the Russian literary language¹⁾ in mid-eighteenth century²⁾ was not an abrupt or sudden event, but an outcome of the persistent struggle to gain ground among languages or language variants. There were dissimilations or assimilations of co-existing languages or language variants at each historical stage of Russian language development under the influence of both language-external circumstances, such as sociocultural or political changes, and language-internal changes.³⁾

* 서울대학교 노어노문학과 교수

- 1) 'Literary language' in this paper is used in the sense of 'standard language.' The 'literary language' is truly a slippery term and can easily mislead the readers, since other than the sense of 'standard language' it has two non-overlapping meanings: the language of literature (*belles lettres*) and the language of anything preserved in written form. The only clear definition to date of the literary language is provided by Isačenko(1958): it should be normalized, polyvalent, stylistically differentiated and obligatory for all.
- 2) According to Issatschenko(1980), the Russian literary language, i. e., CSR (Contemporary Standard Russian) was formed between 1750 and 1825. Although Uspensky(1987) claims that the formation of the literary language came in the 18th century after the period of 'Diglossia' and 'Bilingualism', which lasted until the 17th century in the history of Russian Language, he does not further specify exactly when. Birnbaum(1985) argues that the Russian literary language did not crystallize till the end of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. Thus, although mid-eighteenth century is commonly pointed out as the time of the formation of the Russian literary language, it is not the case that all scholars agree on the issue.

Although I shall not deal with the controversial and unproductive polemics on the origin of Russian literary language, either Russian or Slavonic language alone cannot be claimed to constitute the essence of modern Russian literary language⁴; the long-term process of formation of Russian literary language can be characterized as 'dialectic' rapprochement between the written language, Russian Church Slavonic, on one hand and the spoken vernacular, Russian, on the other. The chancery language with its own stylistic peculiarities included linguistic features of the two languages and accelerated the process of mutual adaptation and accommodation between the two. The internal differentiation of Church Slavonic, despite its significant role in the process of the formation of the literary language, has rarely been investigated. While the rhetorical Slavonic was becoming too anachronistic for common readers with incomplete learning in Slavonic language, simple narrative Slavonic with extensive penetration from the spoken language was widely attested in written texts: the so-called 'simple (простой, упрощенный) narrative Slavonic'(Worth 1978, 1984a), or 'hybrid Slavonic', or 'bad' Slavonic (Klenin 1997) contributed to bridge the gap between the two languages and change the linguistic consciousness of pre-modern period in a fundamental way.

It has been claimed that old genres were adapted to new social changes and new literary genres were stimulated by sociocultural changes, which brought about new language, since the newer genres did not have to be bound to old norms or stylistic conventions (Worth 1976, 1984b). Old norm

-
- 3) The most representative example of the dissimilation between the two languages is the cultural phenomenon of the Second South Slavic Influence. This reactionary event made the two genetically related languages more heterogeneous than ever. My paper is on one form of the assimilation between the given two languages, and the assimilation no doubt promoted the formation of the common core, i. e., the literary language.
- 4) Regarding the polemics with nationalistic flavor, refer to Uspensky(1987), Worth(1984b) interalia, and references therein. Simply put, two opposing views are the Russification of Slavonic on one hand, and Slavonicization of Russian on the other.

or the close bond between content or genre on one hand and language on the other came to be loosened. This increasingly lax relationship between genres and languages must have influenced on the formation of 'common core',⁵⁾ that is, the Russian literary language, since without overcoming the 'polycentric' character of such relationship, it would have been impossible to bridge the gap between spoken and written languages, i. e., Russian and Slavonic registers, which had been in the functionally complementary relationship of "Diglossia".⁶⁾ Although the choice between the two codes, Slavonic and Russian, was made on the basis of the textual tradition from the very beginning of the coexistence of the two languages, it is true that they are not pragmatically the same. The Diglossia period, whether it is actual or exaggerated phenomenon,⁷⁾ is destined to be replaced by the bilingualism period beginning from the end of the 17th century, when the two codes are equal options for the writer (Uspensky 1987). To delve into the concrete process of overcoming Diglossia, however, would require a separate study and I shall only point out that around the seventeenth century the opposition between Russian (spoken) and Slavonic (written) is more complicated by a range of stylistic mixing, one form of which is 'simple narrative Slavonic' register, which is attested mostly in the new narrative genre of secular fictional tales (повесть).

It has been noted that Slavonic language is not homogeneous; I should argue that this register forms a spectrum in terms of "Slavonic" character, ranging from standard or "good" Slavonic to hybrid or "bad" Slavonic,

5) Refer to Worth(1975). The formation of the literary language presupposes monocentric language situation in terms of genres and languages.

6) Originally the concept of 'Diglossia' appears in Ferguson(1959). The key element of this linguistic situation is functionally complementarism between high and low variant languages.

7) On the limited applicability of the concept of Diglossia by Ferguson for Old Russian language situation, refer to Worth(1978). He construes that the answer would be equivocal for the question of the applicability of the concept to medieval Russia and that Diglossia is potential rather than real mainly due to the long tradition of the mixed language, Slavono-Russian.

although there are no solid criteria to judge how "Slavonic" a text is other than linguists' intuitions. What I am interested in this study is a form of mix-and-match, or selection and combination among heterogeneous linguistic elements. The stylistic mixing is never preprogrammed in the writer's linguistic consciousness, which often frustrates analyst's endeavor to identify the register. I shall investigate linguistic features differentiating simple narrative from the authentic and elaborate Slavonic register on one hand or from Russian vernacular register on the other. This may shed light on the mechanism of stylistic differentiations within Russian Church Slavonic, and ultimately the one crucial momentum in the process of the formation of the literary language, since simple narrative Slavonic register itself is a product of the accommodation and assimilation between the Slavonic and Russian registers. Compared to the previous period, the stylistic mixing in relatively later period of Old Russian is free, and yet it is far from being random.

It seems that mixing of registers was not an exceptional phenomenon and that there was a range of stylistic spectrum in pre-modern Russia. Thus, it may not be easy to identify the language of one text as either Slavonic or Russian in the pure sense of the word. Indeed, these two languages were by no means genetically heterogeneous; they had much more in common than not from the very beginning of history of Russian language. Besides, the shared history of co-existence, mutual penetration of the two languages made it difficult to identify registers of texts in absolute terms. Toward the end of Old Russian period, the linguistic reality and consciousness were much more complicated compared to preceding periods.

The given study attempts to identify most characteristic linguistic features of the simple narrative Slavonic, as distinct both from spoken Russian register and from the elaborate Slavonic. To characterize the given register simply as 'hybrid' or 'heterogeneous' fails to show its discriminative character among the components of language structure. The existence of the simple narrative Slavonic register itself has been

recognized,⁸⁾ and yet little attention has been paid to its distinctive linguistic features. This study will not aim at an exhaustively descriptive list of those features, which would require another paper. Instead, this study focuses on some of the most characteristic features identifying simple narrative Slavonic register as a distinct category and as an optimal linguistic medium for the new fictional narrative genre with performative potentials.⁹⁾

II. Some Characteristic Linguistic Features of the Simple Narrative Slavonic Register

As noted above, the binarism of Slavonic and Russian register, or that of written and spoken language is an illegitimate oversimplification in view of the opaque linguistic practice of pre-modern Russia. As non-Slavonic register may not be homogeneous, Slavonic register is not of one kind. What is glossed as "simple narrative Slavonic register", for instance, is not the same as 'rhetorical', 'pedantic', or 'archaic' Slavonic register. Compare the following two text segments.

(1) По темницам с нею ходящи пешима ногама и милостыню носящи и по чудотворным местом обтичющи обе купно зело рано, яко Мария Магдылныи и Мария Ияковля ко гробу господню, тако и сию голубуцы в собор, и в Чудов, и к ризе господни, на ся, яко достойни,возлагающе ризу господню и целующе устнама с теплыми слезами, чудотворцав же мощи лобызающе верными душами.
(Повесть о Боярыне Морозовой)

'Walking around dungeons with her, giving alms, and walking around

8) Klenin(1997) suggests the applicability of the concept of 'interlanguage' for the simple Slavonic register.

9) The examples in this study are from Памятники литературы древней руси, VII век, Книга первая и вторая, 1988. Москва: художественная литература. In this study [...] denotes abbreviations for spatial limitations.

diligently like Marija Magdylini and Marija Jakovlja going to God's grave, these doves went to the Chudov Cathedral for God's chasuble, and putting with dignity God's chasuble onto themselves and kissing it with warm tears and kissing with faithful spirits the miracle-working relics.'

(2) По некоторых днях сташа збиратися родственники того купца за моря торговать. Сынь же купцев услыша то и прииде ко отцу своему и рече [...] Отець же его даде триста рублевъ и отпусти, и наказа родственником своим, дабы его ни в чем не покинули. Онъ же поклонилася им и поехала в корабли. (Повесть о купце, купившем мертвое тело и ставшем царем)

'After a few days, the merchant's relatives got together in order to go for business beyond sea. The merchant's son heard this and came to see his father and said [...] His father gave him three hundred roubles and let him go and instructed his relatives not to abandon him under any circumstances. He bowed to them and left by ship.'

The first example clearly exhibits archaic, complex, and rhetorical Slavonisms in syntax, morphology and lexicon, including dual forms and participles, and hypotactic syntax; in contrast, the second example, representing the simple narrative Slavonic, is more accessible, since clauses are shorter, simpler and less discursive in syntax, and the lexicon is also relatively easily accessible, as compared to that of the first example. In the archaic Slavonic register syntactic discursiveness or embedding rather than simple coordination requires more decoding time for readers. In this register 'aesthetic' or 'poetic' function of language is foregrounded, while the 'referential' or 'cognitive' function of language is backgrounded, and in focus here is 'how' the message is conveyed. In the above example (1), the various levels constituting the language structure contribute to artistic effects: parallelism, metaphor, simile are found and these figures of speech make readers pay attention to how the message is packaged. Thus, Slavonic register is, as a matter of fact, an overarching term encompassing diverse sub-registers, which range from the elaborate

and authentic Slavonic register showing high literacy, profound training and proficiency in Slavonic written tradition, down to the simple Slavonic with inconsistent interventions from the spoken language showing passive knowledge of Slavonic.

The contrast between the above examples, however, is not a matter of pure vs. hybrid Slavonic and the stylistic mixing was a norm rather than an exception in later pre-modern period of Old Russian; what differentiates the elaborate Slavonic register from the simple narrative Slavonic is the mixed agendas or conflicting needs of the latter. The simple narrative Slavonic register is an optimal code choice for a written text with performative potentials, namely conflicting agendas of written tradition in the memory of the writer on one hand, and potential oral performance in reality on the other. As a matter of fact, even the highest Slavonic texts in pre-modern period are not free from vernacular elements, such as the past tense in -л or pleophonic forms or vernacular conjunctions. Heterogeneous itself is found in all kinds of texts to varying degrees in pre-modern period, and thus this cannot be a differentiating factor of Slavonic and Russian registers. Only in the simple narrative Slavonic there exist contradictions and tensions: between narrated event in written medium and speech event in oral medium; or between literacy and orality.

The performance potentials, or simply put, the orality arise from the increased desire of storytelling and reinforced narrativity. Especially the new genre shows 'experiential isomorphism': just as events develop in time on the level of discourse world, the texts belonging to the fictional tale exhibit a sequence of elements which move linearly through time on the level of linguistic expression. Thus, among all, syntax reflects best this experiential iconicism.

There has not been any adequate definition or any serious attempts to identify the simple narrative Slavonic and this is due to the lack of interest in the correlation between the new narrative genre and its register. New secular fictional genre liberated writers from any obligations to follow stylistic conventions according to model texts prepatterned in

their minds. The act of 'narrating' or 'telling', i. e., the writers' narrative act came to contribute to restructuring the language per se. Simple narrative Slavonic register is the language choice made by the writers for that fundamental purpose. One might argue that 'telling a story' is not something novel at all. Indeed there have been innumerable written stories from the early history of Russian literature (письменность). In fact the early chronicle stories, saints' lives, or literary epic tales all belong to the narrative genre and often exhibit a kind of simple narrative Slavonic language. I hypothesize that what is new in the pre-modern newer narratives is not so much the fictional, narrative character per se, as their reinforced performance potentials with orality features based on high narrativity.

In this study I shall point out only most prominent features of the simple narrative Slavonic, especially morphological and syntactic features. For the former, I shall deal with 'metaslavonisms', a cover term for the oppositions which have Church Slavonic and East Slavic pairs (Worth 1974). What follows is some selective distinctive features of the simple narrative Slavonic register. Although this register is identifiable intuitively it is the goal of the study to illuminate what features are most relevant to such intuitive judgements.

2.1. Metaslavonisms

2.1.1. Verb Forms in -л

Aorist or imperfect past tense, which belong to the functional Slavonisms,¹⁰⁾ is clearly one of the essential elements that characterizes a text as belonging to Slavonic register. In other words, without this Slavonic verb form one can hardly assign a text to Slavonic register, either elaborate or simple. In the given pre-modern period of the history of

10) For the distinction between genetic and functional Slavonisms, refer to Avanesov(1973).

Russian language, -л had replaced aorist(imperfect) and perfect tense long before in the colloquial spoken Russian. Simple narrative Slavonic register reflects this oral practice, but basically the register includes predominantly or exclusively aorist forms as the unmarked verb form. The simple past in -л attested among aorists, however, is neither a sufficient condition for the simple narrative Slavonic register, nor a necessary one: even highly elaborate Slavonic texts tend to have -л forms among aorists and the texts predominantly in colloquial Russian may include formulaic aorists (see below). What needs to be investigated is the distributional features of -л in the simple narrative Slavonic register. In this study I shall present a preliminary synopsis of the contexts for the past tense verbs in -л in the simple narrative Slavonic texts. For the mixing of Slavonic and non-Slavonic verb forms in the simple narrative Slavonic register, refer to the following example.

(3) Сам же кравевичъ по вся дни **хождаше** х королю Карлусу и ко прекрасной кравевне Полиместре играти в гусли и тешити ихъ. И за ту свою игру **быль** в великой чести, и **любили** ево корол и кравева зело вельми, а наипаче **жаловала** ево кравевна Полиместра. И не по многих же днех в некое время кравевичъ Василий **играль** пред королем в гусли и **отигра** у короля, **поиде** х кравевне Полиместре играти в гусли на вечерю. (Повесть о Василии Златовласом)

'The king's son (Vasilij) himself used to go to see the King Karlus and his beautiful daughter Polimestra to play gusli and console them. For this play, he was in great honor and was greatly loved by the king and queen, and the king's daughter Polimestra favored him more. Not long after the king's son Vasilij played gusli in front of the King and having finished playing for the king, he went to the king's daughter Polimestra to play gusli for the supper.'

In the above example, the simple past verbs in -л are employed for habitual, repeating events (по вся дни) and the verbs are all stative or non-telic, whereas aorist or imperfect verb forms are employed for the events marking the narrative boundaries or sequence. In origin the past in

-л was the perfect participle and the perfect tense used to be employed for resultative, non-narrative, or commentative and backgrounding discourse function (Klenin 1993, 1995). A sequence of events on the main storyline are presented in aorist verbs, whereas accessory or ancillary events are in -л forms. The discourse motivations for the use of the simple past verbs in -л are indeed legitimate and adequate explications, and yet since these examples are all independent sentences they do fail to show the process of functional extension of past in -л. What has less been investigated is the role of syntactic context in the functional expansion of -л as past tense verb. Some argue that syntax is the end product of grammaticalized discourse functions (Givón 1979) and although this reductionism may be a little dangerous and too radical, the vestige of partial grammaticalization process of discourse functions may be found in the relationship between subordination and the past in -л in Old Russian. I shall deal with hitherto less investigated environments for the hybrid use of aorist and simple past in -л, namely the grammatical (syntactic) and lexical context for the appearance of -л among aorist verb forms. Eventually these also seem to be related to discourse functions and pragmatic orientations of the genre showing the given register.

First, the simple past tense in -л may be found in the subordinate clauses not only in the hypothetical mood, but also in indicative mood. This tendency is understandable given the origin of the past tense in -л.

(4) Воевода же сие слышав **подивися** разуму ея и велми **похвали** воевода, что она ложа своего не **осквернила**. И воевода же **усмехнулся** и **рече** ей [...] И **похвали** ея целомудренны разумъ, яко за очи мужа своего не **посрамила** и таковыя любви с ними не **сотворила** и совету мужа своего с собою не **разлучила** и великую честь **принесла** иму, ложа своего не **осквернила**. (Повесть о Карпе Стулове)

'The governor, having heard this, marveled at her wisdom and praised greatly that she did not soil her bed. and the governor burst into laughter and said to her [...] And he praised her wise reason and that she did not shamed her husband behind his eyes, and did not make love to them, and

did not abandon his advise, and brought him great honor, and did not soil his bed.'

In this example, the subordinate clauses led by *что* or *яко* include *-л* past forms. This distributional tendency may suggest that the use of the past tense in *-л* spread from the subordinate clause denoting conditional or irrealis mood led by conjunctions containing *-бы*, such as *дабы*, *чтобы*, to other subordinate clauses not related to the hypothetical mood. Subordinate clauses are all closely related to the backgrounding discourse function (Tomlin 1985 *inter alia*), which again asserts the correlation between simple past tense in *-л* and backgrounding discourse function. Higher superordinate actions are foregrounded, whereas the clauses including *-л* verb forms play an ancillary role, and these are coded by means of syntactic subordination, not by a marked mood any more. This may require another separate investigation, and suffice it here to point out the crucial syntactic environment of *-л* in simple narrative Slavonic register, which may have much to do with its discourse functions, and eventually its territorial expansion in the history of Russian language.

Second, lexical and semantic constraints also play a crucial role in the use of *-л*. In Slavonic register *verba dicendi* prefacing direct quotes almost always show aorist, mostly, *рече*, *рекоша*, and aorist forms of the verb *глаголати*. Vernacular register rarely employs these verbs; instead it prefers *говорить*, *сказать*, and the historic present tense is often used. The simple narrative Slavonic register tends to show consistent uses of aorists for the *verba dicendi* and this marked distribution stands out more in this register since this register includes *-л* more extensively.¹¹⁾ For verbs of saying, however, aorist is more or less formulaic and ritual. The

11) Even Russian register with colloquial flavor shows this tendency: **И ерыжные приехали** к берегу и **почели** спрашивать [...] **И рече** Бова [...] **И ярыжные взяли** Бову в подездок и **повезли** на корабль. И гости-корабельницы **почели** спрашивать [...] **И рече** Бова [...] **И рече** Бова [...] **И почел** Бова по кораблю похаживать. (Повесть о Бове королевиче)

peculiarities of *verba dicendi* are not novel: even in contemporary Russian, element order, aspect, tense, etc. of these verbs tend to be marked. In the simple narrative Slavonic, for *verba dicendi* there is a strikingly limited inventory of lexicon unlike in elaborate Slavonic: most often verbs *пече* and *рекоша* are employed and the simple past in *-л* tends to be avoided. In fact, the lexical variety of *verba dicendi* is not unrelated to the register of a text: the more diverse the lexical inventory of verbs of saying the given text shows, the more elaborate Slavonic register the text exhibits. In simple narrative Slavonic register, limited lexicon and relatively consistent distribution of aorists for this semantic type confirms the formulaic character of the aorists and the special status of *verba dicendi* among all verbs.

Further, it should be noted that in the simple narrative Slavonic, the lexical meaning and verbal tense is not unrelated. For instance, in *Повесть о древе златом и златом попугае* for the verb (по)велети among 12 instances, only one is aorist verb form *повеле*, and other 11 instances all appear in *-л* forms (по)велел. Other texts in simple narrative Slavonic register also exhibit this invariant correlation between verbal lexeme and tense morpheme. Whether this is relevant to the semantics of a given verb or its lexical peculiarity or other factors needs to be investigated. One plausible motivation is the oral performance potentials of the simple narrative Slavonic register: in the storyteller's memory one and the same lexeme is stored with tense markers attached, which is not easily set apart. This may cause the fixed concatenation of *-л* forms and certain lexemes.

Together with the lexical motivations, semantic motivations may also condition the appearance of *-л*. This has been noted for earlier texts and seems to be one instance showing traditional usage of *-л*.

(5) **Позавиде** же сему лукавый и возмути начальниковъ. И **прислали** указъ разыскать, кто к нимъ ходит и како доходят. И Памфила некоего боровитина **пытали**, **спрашивали** Иродиона. Онъ муку великую **терпелъ**, а не **предал**. А

Родионъ той в то время у него под поломъ **пробыль**. И понеже не повинилься, **спустили** его в дом и он лежа, а крови его текущи, **глагола** жене своей [...] Последи того Памфила и с женою **сослали** в ссылку в Смоленскъ, иже и донныне тамо терпить. (Повесть о Боярыне Морозовой)

'The evil one envied this and stirred up officials. And they sent a decree to find out who went to them and how they got there. And they interrogated a certain Pamfil Borovtin and they were asking for Irodion. He endured great torment. but did not betray him. And this Rodion was under the floor at that time. And since he did not confess, they let him go home and he lay there. blood flowing, and said to his wife [...] Afterwards, that Pamfil and his wife were sent to exile to Smolensk and they suffer there until this day.'

This text portion exhibits an unusually dense concentration of -л although the text which this example is taken from is overall in relatively homogeneous and elaborate Slavonic. This apparent unusual distribution of -л may be related to the semantic domain of 'devil': Rodion's torture is interpreted as devil's act and the semantic domain of devil tends to co-occur with Russisms. The first sentence of the episode, *позавиде же сему лукавый и возмути начальниковъ*, although summarizing and commentative sentence which requires a non-narrative tense, i. e., the past tense in -л, shows an aorist verb form. This leads to the next point, namely, the textual functions of the aorist.

The textual, framing function of aorist has been noted in previous studies. That is, the initial and coda portions of an episode or a given text tend to show aorist verbs, while the simple past in -л is in the non-framing part. The 'ritual' character of the framing portions requires Slavonic register (Timberlake 1995, Song 2000). The most frequent verb form initiating the fictional narrative tales is *бысть*, a formulaic story-telling device of aorist verb form.

(6) **Бысть** во цареграде царь Михаил благочестивъ и богобоязливъ. Велии **быль** к богу подвижень: святая святых **созидаль**, сосуды залтые и серебряные во церкви **поставлял**, церкви пресвященные **воздвизаль** и монастыри

строил, и грады зиждаль. (Сказание о древе златом и златом попугае)

'It came to pass that there was king Mikhail in Tsaregrad, devout and god-fearing. He was greatly devoted to God: he built saints (icons) and put silver and gold vessels and erected holy churches and built monasteries and founded cities.'

The first sentence includes the aorist **бысть**, whereas the following sentences include the simple past verbs in **-л**. Some narrative texts in simple narrative Slavonic register show **быль** in the orientation portions and semantically the two verbs are not much different: the aorist form only signals explicitly the beginning of a narrative tale, the narrative onset boundary on the macro plane. The above example also shows the narrative function of aorist on the episode-onset boundary. This textual function is also related to the oral performance potentials of the new narrative genre.

While aorist is an essential style marker for the Slavonic register, the presence of **-л** should not be construed simply as arbitrary or random, and need to be explained as much as possible. Syntactic environment, discourse-functional motivations, lexical and semantic motivations, textual framing functions are all relevant to the presence of marked aorist or simple past in **-л** in relative distributional terms.

2.2.2. Pleophony

Another important criterion for defining a text as Slavonic or non-Slavonic in written texts is the opposition between pleophonic and non-pleophonic forms, such as **град** vs. **город**, **глас** vs. **голос**, **злат** vs. **золот**, **глава** vs. **голова**, and **древо** vs. **дерево**. This metaslavonism has been the most reliable index for assigning a text as Slavonic or non-Slavonic. Unlike both the colloquial Russian register, where pleophonic morphemes predominate and the elaborate Slavonic register, where non-pleophonic forms predominate, the simple narrative Slavonic register tends to show a mixture of non-pleophonic and pleophonic forms. The former outnumbers the latter, and yet unlike the elaborate Slavonic register, the simple narrative Slavonic register apparently allows greater

variations or less consistency in using pleophonic forms with no explicable motivations.

Notable is the text-internal peculiar tendency: lexical concatenation in a text behaves as a unit without allowing any variations. Refer to the following example.

(7) И некоторого вечера веселящися со князи и бояры, пьюще и тешася велми. И слышавъ, что древа **златова** одна ветвь. А на той ветви **золотой** попугай говорит человеческимъ голосомъ, что сей де ноши царю Левтасару напрасною смертию умереть. (Сказание о древе златом и златом попугае)

'One evening (the tsar) was enjoying himself with princes and boyars, drinking and amusing themselves. He heard that there was one bough and on that bough a parrot speaks in human voice that in that evening the tsar Levtsar should die with wrong death.'

In the text, where the above sentences are attested, *попугай* is always concatenated with *золотой*, whereas *древо* with *златой*. The text as a whole shows predominant non-pleophonic forms, except non-variable pleophonic *умереть*, *котол*, *серебряный*, *сторожа*, etc.; *город* predominates *град*, whereas *глас* and *голос* are free variations. Thus, lexicon is one factor in the choice of one form or the other, as was also the case with the selection of the simple past tense in *-л*. This kind of correlation between lexicon and metaslavonism seems to be involved with more fundamental reasons.

The variable pleophonic and non-pleophonic forms have some motivating factors. Above all, both *золотой попугай* and *златое древо* are rhythmically 'ideal' concatenation. Simple narrative Slavonic text takes a written form as mode of textual existence, but draws on speech rhythm for potential performance. It is well known that to justify the margin the scribe might have chosen either pleophonic or non-pleophonic forms, and yet the rhythmical factor representing orality has usually been neglected in previous studies. The apparent free, arbitrary variations should be reconsidered in view of these performance potentials.

Furthermore, *попугай*, as compared to *древо* (which is already a non-pleophonic form) is more accessible to the human domain in the text, since it speaks in 'human voice': *Золотой попугай говорит человеческим голосом* vs. *На том древе птицы поют различными гласы*. In this vein, the choice is dictated by the semantic domains of the sacred vs. the secular. *Человеческим голосом* and *различные гласы* confirm the correlation between the semantic and register factors: the former belongs to the human (secular) semantic domain, which is realized by Russisms, and the latter shows register harmony between the modifier with the Slavonic prefix *раз-* and the non-pleophonic head noun.

Furthermore, the choice between *град* vs. *город* in this text is related to the semantic parameter of 'definiteness': *город* is related to indefiniteness or non-referentiality, while *град* is used in definite and specific, referential meaning. Compare the two instances.

(8) *Благочестивый же царь Михаил велелъ дары принять, а посломъ повелелъ древа смотреть, а на **города** и на именья древа златова не отдал.* (Сказание о древе златом и златом попугае)

'The pious tsar Mikhail ordered (them) to take the gifts and look at the trees, but for cities and estates he did not exchange the trees.'

(9) *Тот же час съехавшеся весь **град** на царевъ двор, и начаша ходити смотреть чюда в полату по десяти человекъ.* (Сказание о древе златом и златом попугае)

'At that time the whole city people got together in the tsar's court and began to go to see the miracle in the chamber by ten people'

In previous studies, the opposition between pleophonic and non-pleophonic forms was usually reduced to the opposition between celestial or religious domain and earthly or secular domains on the discourse level. What has less been investigated, however, is semantics of the phrase level, and this narrow level or scope as well as macro-level semantics needs to be investigated. The semantic features of referentiality and

definiteness can be related to the semantic parameter of 'individuation' on the morphological level.

(10) В то же время во **граде** Устюге некто **быль**¹²⁾ житель **града** того Фома, по прозванию Грудцынь-Усовъ, их же родъ и доднесь во **граде** томъ влечется. Той убо Фома, видя в России таковое нестроение и нестерпимыя пакости от нечистивыхъ ляховъ и не хотя жити, оставляетъ великий **град** Устюгъ и домъ свой и преселяется з женою в понизовыхъ славный **град** Казань, зане не бысть в понизовыхъ **городахъ** злочестывыя литвы. (Повесть о Савве Грудцыне)

'At that time in the city of Ustjug, there was a resident called Foma, nicknamed Grudcyn-Usov and their family is in that city until this day. That Foma, seeing such a disorder and unbearable harm done by innumerable Poles in Russia and not wanting to live there, left the great city of Ustjug and his home and moved with his wife to the city of Kazan, on the lower reaches, since in the cities on the lower reaches there were no Lithuanians.'

The plural noun *городахъ* is indeed a less individuated form, as compared to the singular *град*. The proper noun always accompanies *град*, since the proper noun is maximally individuated among nouns.¹³⁾ The correlation between individuation, referentiality, definiteness and meta-slavonism of pleophony needs to be investigated in greater depth, and yet it may be that the non-pleophonic forms are more related to the definite

12) The *-л* form of *быль* is very peculiar in that this text has very few *-л* forms and the text is in relatively homogeneous Slavonic register, compared with other texts in simple narrative Slavonic texts. Further, this distribution contradicts my earlier argument for the textual framing function of aorist. The given paragraph, however, is not located in the beginning of the text and this text portion about Foma Grudcyn has backgrounding function for the upcoming introduction of the main hero. Thus, this usage of *-л* may have something to do with the discourse backgrounding function, and on the macro plane at that.

13) In view of this, the opposition in contemporary Russian between *Новгород* and *Ленинград* is understandable. Slavonic non-pleophonic form is not only employed for solemn and dignified semantic flavor, but also for definiteness and individuation.

meaning of the noun and more individuated singular, rather than indefiniteness and less individuated plural number.

Thus, pleophony is motivated not only by what is narrated, but also by speech rhythm, lexicon and semantic factors, although free variations with no clear stylistic intentions on the writer's part are widespread and common in the simple narrative Slavonic register, as is also true in the aorist distribution. The simple narrative Slavonic register is most strikingly distinct from the authentic and elaborate Slavonic register in that it accommodates the stronger need and desire of potential oral performance or storytelling.

2.2. Syntax

Among the components of language structure syntax is most pertinent to telling events or narrativity: both pertain to the linearity on the temporal, or secondarily, on the spatial plane. Besides, telling events on the performative plane is most closely related to syntax; it is a matter of course then that simple narrative Slavonic employs Russisms in its syntactic frame. Although lexicon and morphology exhibits register variations, the syntactic structure is more consistently simple: coordination is unmarked and the sentence is closely knit together around verbs without ancillary elements. This eclectic compromise, although this is apparently heterogeneous or a sign of "bad" Slavonic, is to be regarded as one of important changes in language practice. Thus the communicative need of the writer or story-telling agenda is most effectively realized in the syntax, since the syntagmatic aspect of telling events on the temporal plane of the speech event concurs with the syntactic structure of the narrated event.

The simple narrative Slavonic register is maximally different from the elaborate Slavonic register in its syntactic structure. Since the latter tends to trigger rhetorical complexity, which is most directly reflected in syntactic structure, the elaborate Slavonic register is sharply in contrast with the simple narrative Slavonic in the sentence structure. The syntactic

structure in the simple narrative Slavonic is centripetal centered on the verb, and clauses or sentences form a parallel structure with focus on the swift advancement of the storyline. With respect to element order, dislocation or distant ordering is rare and neutral element order, i. e., subject-verb-object, is unmarked. Coordination and chain-linking structure are predominant and the sentence (clause) is short and focused on verb rather than modifying or adjunctive elements like adjectives, adnominal genitive NPs, or adverbs. These elements, unlike the subject, verb, objects, which constitute main skeleton of the sentence, are additional and less essential in advancing the plot line. In simple narrative Slavonic each clause is coordinated by the bookish Slavonic conjunction *и*, or less frequently by non-Slavonic colloquial *а*, and this simple chain-linking (цепное нанизывание) of short clauses is very characteristic of the given register.¹⁴⁾ of short clauses is very characteristic of the given register. The sequence of clauses iconically reflects the order of events in discourse world on the temporal level.

The focus on verbs tightens sentences and imparts to them a centripetal character. This is sharply contrasted with elaborate Slavonic register with discursive and digressive syntax. In the elaborate Slavonic register verbs and dependent elements are hindered by other subordinate or intervening modifying elements, whereas in the simple narrative Slavonic interruptions by subordinate clauses or other sentential constituents are rare. Syntactic straightforwardness of the latter is in sharp contrast with the complicated syntax of the former. Compare the following examples, which were already adduced above.

(11)=(1)) По темницам с нею ходящи пешима ногама и милостыню носящи и по чудотворным местом отичуши обе купно зело рано, яко Мария Магдыльни и Мария Ияковля ко гробу господню, тако и сию голубуцы в собор, и в

14) Refer to Borkovskij(1979) for details regarding this syntactic (discourse) structure and its semantics, as well as the stylistic features of the conjunctions employed for that construction.

Чудов, и к ризе господни, на ся, яко достойни, возлагающе ризу господню и целующе устнама с теплыми слезами, чудотворцав же мощи лобызающе верными душами. (Повесть о Боярыне Морозовой)

'Walking around dungeons with her, giving alms, and walking around diligently like Marija Magdylyni and Marija Jakovlja going to God's grave, these doves went to the Chudov Cathedral for God's chasuble, and putting with dignity God's chasuble onto themselves and kissing it with warm tears and kissing with faithful spirits the miracle-working relics.'

(12)=(4) Воевода же сие слышав подивися разуму ея и велми похвали воевода, что она ложа своего не осквернила. И воевода же усмехнулся и рече ей [...] И похвали ея целомудренный разумь, яко за очи мужа своего не посрамила и таковыя любви с ними не сотворила и совету мужа своего с собою не разлучила и великую честь принесла ему, ложа своего не осквернила. (Повесть о Карпе Стулове)

'The governor, having heard this, marveled at her wisdom and praised greatly that she did not soil her bed. and the governor burst into laughter and said to her [...] And he praised her wise reason and that she did not shamed her husband behind his eyes, and did not make love to them, and did not abandon his advise, and brought him great honor, and did not soil his bed.'

The first example shows rhetorically complex discourse and accordingly, syntactic complexity: gerunds function as finite verbs and modifying phrases overshadow main constituents, especially, verbs. The frequent uses of the modifying noun phrases in instrumental case contribute to the discursive syntax. The second example, by contrast, shows simple syntax and verb-orientedness. Chain-linking of short clauses, where verbs (finite or non-finite) or their objects are not outweighed by modifying elements, gives the narrative a sense of continuity and cohesion, and speeds up the flow of narrated events. In contrast, in elaborate Slavonic register narrative speed is generally slowed down due to discursive syntax. In the simple narrative Slavonic register, dative absolutes are very rare, and the Slavonic subordinating conjunctions, such as *яко*, *еже*, *понеже*, *аще* relativizers in *-же* are not frequent. Although coordination is predominant in the simple

narrative Slavonic register, the subordinating conjunctions, such as *как*, *который*, *что*, *чтобы*, which are indubitably Russisms, are occasionally found. Inter-textual variations are great in the use of conjunctions, but common to all the simple narrative Slavonic texts are the dominant use of coordinations and the lack of heavy use of Slavonic conjunctions. The Slavonic syntactic particles or connective particles, such as *же*, *бо*, tend to be used freely in the given register, which can be classified as coordinators rather than subordinators.¹⁵⁾ These syntactic particles, although Slavonisms with bookish flavor, are actively employed in the simple narrative Slavonic: these are comparable to the aorists of *verba dicendi*, such as *рече*, *рекоша*, in that they can be exploited as style markers with formulaic character.

The syntax of the simple narrative Slavonic register is very similar to that of the vernacular, which is a form of written language with Russian elements, and yet it is very distinct from the colloquial register: the sentence-initial coordinating conjunctions operating on the discourse level, especially the syntactic or connective particle, are characteristic of the Slavonic register, whereas the colloquial register shows discourse ellipsis and asyndeton. Compare the simple narrative Slavonic syntax with the syntax of spoken Russian language (13) or colloquial Russian language syntax (14).

(13) И та мамка поехала и просила всех дворянских дочерей к госпоже своей Аннушке, и по тому ея прошению все обещались быть. И та мамка ведает, что у Фрола Слобеева есть сестра, девица, и приехала та мамка в дом Фрола Скобеева и просила сестру ево, чтоб она пожаловала в дом стол-ника Нардина-Нащокина к Аннушке. (Повесть о Фроле Скобееве)

'And the nanny went and asked all the gentry daughters to come to her

15) The syntactic particles or connective particles are the particles whose main functions are cohesive as well as discourse-deictic and speaker-deictic, and often they are identified as conjunctions. Conjunction and particle are not mutually exclusive categories, and I employ this term 'syntactic particle' as an eclectic term combining the two parts of speech.

mistress Annushka, and for her asking all promised to go. And that nanny knows that Frol Skobeev has a sister, unmarried woman, and the nanny came to Frol Skobeev's house and asked his sister to visit the house of the stolnik, Nardin-Nashchokin for Annushka.'

(14) Посемь привезли въ Брацкой острогъ и в тюрьму кинули, соломки дали. И сидель до Филипова поста в студеной башне — тамъ зима в те поры живеть — да богъ грель и без платья! Что собачка в сололке лежу: коли накормятъ, коли нетъ. Мышей много было, я их скуфьею биль — и батошка не дадутъ. Дурачки! все на брюхе лежалъ: спина гнила, блохъ да вшей было много. Хотель на Пашкова кричать: «Прости!» да сила божия возбранила — велено терпеть. (Житие Аввакума)

'Afterwards they brought me to the Bratskij fortress and tossed me into the dungeon, and gave me a little pile of straw. And I was locked up till St. Philip's Fast in a freezing tower. Sometimes they fed me, sometimes, not. The mice were plentiful and I swatted them with my *skuf'ja* — the silly fools wouldn't even give me a stick. I lay on my belly all the time; my back was rotting. Plentiful too were the fleas and lice. I wanted to shout at Pashkov, "Forgive me!", but the power of God did forefend it; it was ordained that I endure.'¹⁶⁾

In (13), syntactic structure is as straightforward as the simple narrative Slavonic register, and the chain-linking connective particle *и* is omnipresent for the sequential sentences. Thus, with respect to syntax, simple narrative Slavonic register is not strikingly different from the spoken language. In (14), in contrast, asyndeton, discourse ellipsis, colloquial conjunctions, and colloquial element order with emotional tone characteristic of the living speech in old Russia mark the syntax of the Russian register.

16) This translation is from *Archipriest Avvakum The Life written by Himself* by Kenneth N. Brostrom(1979), Michigan Slavic Publications.

III. Conclusion

The simple narrative Slavonic register is distinct from the elaborate or canonical Slavonic register on one hand and from the Russian register on the other, thus playing a mediating role in the formation of Russian literary language. The narrative Slavonic register is maximally differentiated from elaborate Slavonic by means of simpler syntax: verb-oriented sentence structure, dominance of coordination over subordination, and iconic ordering of clauses according to the sequence of events in the discourse world, namely *ordo naturalis*. These syntactic features make the progression of storyline swift.

The simple narrative Slavonic register, however, is a variant of Slavonic register: non-pleophonic forms tend to be predominant over pleophonic forms and aorist verb forms override Russian simple past forms in -л. One may regard this simple narrative Slavonic as an intermediate or mixed register between authentic Slavonic and Russian. Indeed the simple narrative Slavonic register exploits linguistic elements of both registers, preparing for the future formation of the 'neutral core' and reconciling the traditions and the innovations. The stylistic variations in the simple narrative Slavonic register arise from two conflicting needs: 'story-telling' agenda with written language medium. Written 'channel' necessarily evokes Slavonic as its conventional or unmarked code, while story-telling agenda and the freedom of the new genre from traditional requirements do not exclude Russisms. The Old Russian writers' ingenious choice was to exploit some Slavonic register marker, such as aorists (imperfects), or non-pleophonic forms, and put these in simple non-Slavonic syntactic frame. Indeed this mix-and-match character of simple Slavonic register made a contribution to overcoming Diglossia and forming the Russian literary language.

References

- Avanesov, R. I.(1973) K voprosam periodizacii istorii russkogo jazyka, VII meždunarodnyj s"ezd slavistov, Moskva, 5-24.
- Birnbaum, Henrik(1985) Orality, Literacy, and Literature in Old Rus', Die Welt der Slaven, 161-196.
- Borkovskij, V. I.(1979) Istoričeskaja grammatika russkogo jazyka. Moskva: nauka.
- Ferguson, Charles A.(1959) Diglossia, Word (15): 325-40.
- Givón, Talmy(1979) On Understanding Grammar. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Isačenko, A. V.(1958) Kakova specifika literaturnogo dvujazyčija slavjanskix narodov, Voprosy jazykoznanija (3): 42-45.
- Issatschenko, Alexander V.(1980) Russian, The Slavonic Literary Languages: Formation and Development. ed. by Schenker, Alexander M & Edward Stankiewicz, 119-142.
- Klenin, Emily(1993) The Perfect Tense in the Laurentian Manuscript of 1377, American Contributions to the Eleventh International Congress of Slavists, ed. by Maguire, Robert A. & Alan Timberlake, Columbus, Ohio: Slavica.
- _____ (1995) The Verbal System of a Seventeenth-Century Icon Legend: Morphology and Discourse Functions. Russian Linguistics, 19: 77-89.
- _____ (1997) Legends and Language in Sixteenth-Century Moscow, Culture and Identity in Muscovy, 1359-1584, ed. by Kleimola, A. M. & G. D. Lenhoff. Mosow: ITZ-Grarant.
- Song, Eun-Ji(2000) Stylistic Variations in Old Russian Texts. Russian Studies 10(1): 193-219.
- Timberlake, Alan(1995) Avvakum's Aorist. Russian Linguistics, 19: 25-43.
- Tomlin, Russel S.(1985) Foregrounding-backgrounding Information and the Syntax of Subordination, Text, 5(1-2): 85-122.
- Uspensky, Boris A.(1987) Istorija russkogo literaturnogo jazyka XI-XVII,

München: Verlag Otto Sagner.

Worth, Dean S.(1974) Slavonisms in the Uloženie of 1649, *Russian Linguistics* 1: 225-249.

_____ (1975) Was There a "Literary Language" in Kievan Rus'? *The Russian Review* 34: 1-9

_____ (1978) On "Diglossia" in Medieval Russia. *Die Welt der Slaven*, 371-393.

_____ (1984a) Stylistic Variants within Russian Church Slavonic (on the Language of the "Solovesckij Paertik"). *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach*, 323-331.

_____ (1984b) Toward A Social History of Russia, *Medieval Russian Culture*, ed. by Birnbaum, Henrik & Michael S. Flier, Berkeley: University of California Press, 227-246.

요약문

‘단순서사체 교회슬라브어’의 몇 가지 언어적 특성에 관한 연구

송은지

본 논문은 교회슬라브어 레지스터의 한 종류인 소위 ‘단순서사체 교회슬라브어’의 언어적 특성에 관한 개관적 연구로서 정교하고 규범적인 교회슬라브어와 대조되는 레지스터로서 허구적 서사장르에 종종 나타나는 단순서사체 교회슬라브어의 주요 언어적 특성을 연구한 것이다. 필자는 이 단순서사체 교회슬라브어가 주로 혼합된 레지스터의 양상을 띠는 측면에 주목하여, 교회슬라브어의 한 변이체로서의 이 레지스터가 정교한 교회슬라브어와 어떤 언어적 차이를 보이는지에 관하여 살펴보았다. 단순서사체 교회슬라브어는 결국 러시아표준어(문학어)의 형성에 적지 않은 역할을 수행한 것으로 보이는데, 그것은 현대러시아어의 기원을 형성하는 두 가지 기본적 언어적 자원, 즉 교회슬라브어와 러시아어의 폭넓은 상호근접과 수용을 가능케 하였기 때문이다. 본 논문은 단순서사체 교회슬라브어의 여러 가지 언어적 특성 가운데 특히 형태적인 측면과 통사적 측면을 관찰하였다.

우선 메타교회슬라브어, 특히 아오리스트와 더불어 완료분사 출신의 -лl 형 과거동사의 분포와 충음화 형태의 분포를 살폈고, 두 번째로 통사적 특성을 살폈다. -лl 과거의 분포적 특성 가운데 본 연구에서 새롭게 관찰된 것은 그것의 통사적 환경 (종속절)과 담화기능의 상관관계로서 이것이 -лl 과거형의 기능적 영역확대 과정을 파악할 수 있는 단서를 제공할 가능성을 제시하였고, 또 한편 텍스트 내에서 나타나는 -лl 과거형과 특정 어휘 결합의 규칙성 혹은 일관성이 서사장르의 구술성을 간접적으로 시사할 수 있는 단서가 될 가능성을 제시하였다. 더불어, 발화동사의 특이성도 지적되었는데, 이같은 의미의 동사들은 의례적 아오리스트로 나타나고 또한 텍스트의 서두부분에 나타나는 관용적 아오리스트 역시 의례성을 부여하는 서사장르의 표지 역할을 수행한다. 단순서사체 교회슬라브어에 나타나는 충음화 형태와 관련하여 본 연구는 비충음화 대 충음화 대립이 의미적 ‘한정성’, ‘지시성’, ‘개별성’과 연관될 가능

성을 제시하였고, 더불어 여기에도 어휘적 결합이 일정한 규칙성을 띠어 구성에 공헌한다는 측면에 주목하였다. 한편, 단순사사체 교회슬라브어의 동사적 특성을 살펴보면, 음위접속과 동사중심의 구성적 특성이 그 주요한 특성으로 파악되었고 접속사 등을 통한 연쇄사슬구조가 무표적으로 나타나며 교회 슬라브어체 음속접속사나 관계사는 매우 제한적으로 사용된다는 사실이 제시되었다.

새로운 장르의 도입과 탐구범역 사회, 문화 환경이 어울려 언어적 실험에 유효적인 맥락을 형성하여 단순사사체 교회슬라브어가 세속적 하위 서사장르 의 최적의 무표적 코드로서 선택되었고, 특히, 이 단순사사체 교회슬라브어는 그 복합적 성격, 즉 그것이 문자적 전통과 규범에 무표적인 교회슬라브어와, 계고된 서사성과 잠재적 구성성에 적합한 러시아어와의 결합에 의해 형성된 코드라는 점에서 향후 원대표준러시아어의 형성에 적지 않은 공헌을 한 것으로 보인다.

논문시일정

논문투고: 2003. 10. 15
 논문심사: 2003. 10. 31 ~ 11. 28
 심사완료: 2003. 12. 5

참고문헌(출처지)

소 추: 서울대학교 교수
 출판: 미국 UCLA
 전문: 러시아어학
 대표논문: 「러시아어 텍스트에서 지시적 선택으로서의 영대용」(러시아연구, 2002)
 대표저작: